

Claim 1

Claim 1 is directed to a method of controlling a first and second remote controlled apparatus. The method comprises steps of: receiving, at said first apparatus, first control signals that are associated with a first remote control device, said first apparatus being operatively responsive to said first control signals and to signals received from a broadcast medium that provides at least one of audio and video signals from a media content provider; receiving, at said first apparatus, second control signals from said broadcast medium that are associated with a second remote control device that is physically distinct from the first remote control device, said second apparatus being operatively responsive to said second control signals; storing said second control signals in said first apparatus; accessing said stored second control signals responsive to selected ones of said first control signals; and wirelessly transmitting said accessed second control signals from said first apparatus to said second apparatus to remotely control said second apparatus responsive to selected ones of said first control signals received from said first remote control device.

Neither Levine nor Kwoh, taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests, “receiving, at said first apparatus, second control signals from said broadcast medium that are associated with a second remote controlled device that is physically distinct from the first remote controlled device, said second apparatus being operatively responsive to said second control signals,” as recited in claim 1.

As discussed during the telephone interview, Levine discloses a system including a VCR 12 coupled to a cable box 10. However, neither Kwoh nor Levine teaches or suggests that the VCR 12 is capable of receiving control signals from a broadcast medium to which the cable box 10 is operatively responsive.

As pointed out during the telephone interview, Kwoh discloses that VPS signals may be extracted from a television signal and used by a remote control device to verify that a user has entered a correct G-CODE into the remote control device. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in either reference that the cable box of Levine is operatively responsive to these VPS signals that are extracted from the television signal. In view of the foregoing, Applicant noted, and the Examiner agreed, that the combination of Levine and Kwoh does not teach receiving

second control signals from a broadcast medium to which the second apparatus is operatively responsive, as recited in claim 1.

Thus, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Levine and Kwoh. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 23-31 and 41 depend from claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of claims 23-31 be withdrawn.

Claim 32

Claim 32 is directed to a remotely controlled apparatus. The apparatus comprises: first receiving means for receiving first control signals from a first remote control device; second receiving means for receiving signals from a broadcast medium that provides at least one of audio and video signals from a media content provider, said signals from the broadcast medium including second control signals that are associated with a second remotely controlled apparatus that is operatively responsive to said second control signals from a second remote control device that is physically distinct from the first remote control device; storage means for storing said second control signals; control means for accessing said stored second control signals responsive to selected ones of said first control signals thus obtaining accessed second control signals; and transmitting means for wirelessly transmitting said accessed second control signals to said second remotely controlled apparatus to remotely control said second remotely controlled apparatus; wherein the transmitting means is further operative to wirelessly transmit said accessed second control signals received by said second receiving means from the broadcast medium to said second remotely controlled apparatus as said second control signals, to remotely control the second remotely controlled apparatus.

As is clear from the discussion above, neither Levine nor Kwoh, taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests, “second receiving means for receiving signals from a broadcast medium that provides at least one of audio and video signals from a media content provider, said signals from the broadcast medium including second control signals that are associated with a second remotely controlled apparatus that is operatively responsive to said second control signals from a second remote controlled device that is physically distinct from the

first remote controlled device.” Thus, claim 32 patentably distinguishes over Levine and Kwoh. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 33-35 depend from claim 32 and are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 33-35 be withdrawn.

Claims 36

Claims 36 is directed to a remote controlled system comprising: a first remotely controlled apparatus operationally responsive to first control signals associated with a first remote control device and to signals received from a broadcast medium that provides at least one of audio and video signals from a media content provider; and a second remotely controlled apparatus operatively responsive to second control signals associated with a second remote control device that is physically distinct from the first remote control device; wherein said first remotely controlled apparatus wirelessly transmits said second control signals to said second remotely controlled apparatus based upon said signals received from the broadcast medium to remotely control said second remotely controlled apparatus responsive to selected ones of said first control signals.

As is clear from the discussion above neither Levine nor Kwoh, taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests “a first remotely controlled apparatus operationally responsive to first control signals associated with the first remote control device and to signals received from a broadcast medium that provides at least one of audio of video signals from a media content provider” and “a second remotely controlled apparatus operatively responsive to second control signals associated with a second remote control device that is physically distinct from the first remote control device.” Thus, claim 36 patentably distinguishes over Levine and Kwoh. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 37-40 depend from claim 36 and are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 37-40 be withdrawn.